REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and arguments presented below.

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-9, 11-25, and 27-28 are pending.

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-16, 18, 21, and 25-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,092,517 of Pruecklmayer, et al. ("Pruecklmayer").

Claims 1, 12, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. patent No. 6,651,178 of Voegeli, et al. ("Voegeli").

Claims 6, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Pruecklmayer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,911,809 of Kernahan ("Kernahan").

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-16, 18, 21, and 25-28 were rejected as being anticipated by Pruecklmayer. Claims 1, 12, and 27 were independently rejected as being anticipated by Voegeli.

Applicant notes that claim 26 was canceled in the previous amendment and thus presumes that the Examiner did not intend to include claim 26 in the rejection. Applicant submits none of pending claims 1-9, 11-25, and 27-28 is anticipated by Pruecklmayer or Voegeli.

With respect to Pruecklmayer or Voegeli, applicant submits the cited references *do not teach or disclose: dynamically controlling at least one power supply controller parameter as the supply level controller controls the variable power supply to the electronic device, wherein the at least one controller parameter corresponds to at least one of a control system loop filter compensator setting, a digital-to-analog converter setting, and an analog-to-digital converter setting.*

The extent of the control disclosed by Pruecklmayer appears to be limited to controlling the pulse width of the modulated pulse width modulator. Moreover, this pulse width appears to be selected prior to any transition between supply levels and *does not appear to be dynamically varied during the transition* (Pruecklmayer, col. 6, lines 27-38).

Although the Examiner has asserted that different pulse width "parameters" correspond to a DAC setting, applicant disagrees to the extent applicant understands the Examiner's analogy. Changing the scale, gain, offset, update interval, conversion time, number of bits, etc. would correspond to a DAC setting. The DAC setting parameter controls the mapping, i.e., the processing or handling of the digital input in order to produce the analog output. Simply providing a different input to obtain a different DAC output is not changing any DAC settings.

Accordingly *Pruecklmayer does not teach or disclose: dynamically controlling at least one power supply controller parameter as the supply level controller controls the variable power supply to the electronic device, wherein the at least one controller parameter corresponds to at least one of a control system loop filter compensator setting, a digital-to-analog converter setting, and an analog-to-digital converter setting.*

Voegeli discloses a power supply system including a power system controller, multiple programmable power supplies, power bus, power control bus, communications bus, and a plurality of electronic circuit loads. The power supply system applies power to the power bus via the power supplies when each of the electronic circuit loads have compatible power requirements. The electronic circuit loads provide the power system control with the electronic circuit load power requirements using the communications bus. The power supply controller sends commands to the power supplies over the power control bus. (Voegeli, col. 1, lines 50-67; col. 2).

The "electronic circuit load power requirements" of Voegeli appear to be multiple voltages and other parameters for each electronic circuit load. The requests are thus for multiple voltages and other constraints for each electronic

circuit load. To the extent the requests are compatible, Voegeli supplies all the requested voltages to the modules on the power bus. To the extent the requests are not compatible, Voegeli does not supply power to any modules.

The power requirements of the electronic load circuit may include voltage control parameters, turn-on sequencing control parameters, voltage delta control parameters, and time delta control parameters. (Voegeli, col. 2, lines 25-35).

Applicant respectfully submits that none of these parameters corresponds to any of a control system loop filter compensator setting, a digital-to-analog converter setting, or an analog-to-digital converter setting. Moreover, there is no disclosure that any parameters are dynamically modified while power is being supplied. To the contrary, Voegeli negotiates requirements of the electrical circuit loads prior to the application of power. If there is a conflict, then no power is applied. If there is not a conflict, then power is applied in accordance with the electrical circuit load requirements. However, neither the requirements nor the profile is modified during the application of power.

The Examiner has again analogized providing a different input voltage to the DAC as being equivalent to changing the DAC settings. As noted above, simply changing the input to produce a different output does not alter the DAC settings. Changing the scale, gain, offset, update interval, conversion time, number of bits, etc. would correspond to a DAC setting. Voegeli does not teach modification of such settings and certainly not dynamic modification of any type of setting during the application of power.

Accordingly *Voegeli does not teach or disclose: dynamically controlling at least one power supply controller parameter as the supply level controller controls the variable power supply to the electronic device, wherein the at least one controller parameter corresponds to at least one of a control system loop filter compensator setting, a digital-to-analog converter setting, and an analog-to-digital converter setting.*

Thus neither Pruecklmayer nor Voegeli discloses: *dynamically controlling at least one power supply controller parameter as the supply level controller controls the*

variable power supply to the electronic device, wherein the at least one controller parameter corresponds to at least one of a control system loop filter compensator setting, a digital-to-analog converter setting, and an analog-to-digital converter setting.

In contrast, claims 1, 12, and 27 include the language:

> 1. A method comprising:
> controlling a variable power supply to supply power to an electronic device at different supply levels; and
> *dynamically controlling a value of at least one power supply controller parameter in controlling the variable power supply to supply power to the electronic device, wherein the at least one controller parameter corresponds to at least one of a control system loop filter compensator setting, a digital-to-analog converter setting, and an analog-to-digital converter setting.*

(Claim 1)(*emphasis added*)

> 12. An electronic device comprising:
> a supply level controller coupled to control a variable power supply to supply power to the electronic device at different supply levels; and
> *a controller parameter(s) controller coupled to dynamically control at least one power supply controller parameter for the supply level controller as the supply level controller controls the variable power supply to supply power to the electronic device, wherein the at least one controller parameter corresponds to at least one of a control system loop filter compensator setting, a digital-to-analog converter setting, and an analog-to-digital converter setting.*

(Claim 12)(*emphasis added*)

> 27. An apparatus comprising:
> means for controlling a variable power supply to supply power to an electronic device at different supply levels; and
> *means for dynamically controlling a value of at least one power supply controller parameter as the variable power supply is controlled, wherein the at least one controller parameter corresponds to at least one of a control system loop filter compensator setting, a digital-to-analog converter setting, and an analog-to-digital converter setting.*

(Claim 27)(*emphasis added*)

Thus applicant submits claims 1, 12, and 27 are not anticipated by Pruecklmayer or Voegeli. Given that claims 2-9 and 11 depend from claim 1, claims 13-25 depend from claim 12, and claim 28 depends from claim 27,

applicant submits claims 2-9, 11, 13-25, and 28 are likewise not anticipated by the cited references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections have been overcome.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection

Claims 6, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 24 were rejected as being unpatentable over Pruecklmayer in view of Kernahan. Applicant submits, however, that claims 6, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 24 are dependent claims and as previously noted, Kernahan does not resolve the deficiencies of Pruecklmayer argued above with respect to the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections. Accordingly, applicant submits claims 1, 12, and 27 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of the cited references.

Given that claims 2-9 and 11 depend from claim 1, claims 13-25 depend from claim 12, and claim28 depends from claim 27, applicant submits claims 2-9, 11, 13-25, and 28 are likewise patentable over the cited references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections have been overcome.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and arguments presented above, applicant respectfully submits the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. Accordingly, claims 1-9, 11-25, and 27-28 as amended should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If there are any issues that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at **(512) 858-9910**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 25, 2008

William D. Davis
Reg. No. 38,428